



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/088,651	06/20/2002	Jerome Michel Jacques Bibette	0512-1023	2772

466 7590 10/11/2005

YOUNG & THOMPSON
745 SOUTH 23RD STREET
2ND FLOOR
ARLINGTON, VA 22202

EXAMINER

METZMAIER, DANIEL S

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1712

DATE MAILED: 10/11/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/088,651

Applicant(s)

BIBETTE ET AL.

Examiner

Daniel S. Metzmaier

Art Unit

1712

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 & 27 Sept 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 18-37 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 18-20, 23 and 26-37 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 21, 22, 24 and 25 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claims 18-37 are pending.

Response to Amendment

1. Applicant's request for reconsideration of the finality of the rejection of the last Office action is persuasive and, therefore, the finality of that action is withdrawn. The rejection under 35 USC 112, second paragraph has been withdrawn in view of applicants arguments at pages 3 to 5 of the response filed September 27, 2005. Attention may be further directed to claims of Bibette et al, US 6,627,603.

Allowable Subject Matter

2. The indicated allowability of claims 18-37 is withdrawn in view reconsideration of the combined prior art reference(s) to WO 99/07463, which is a family member of Bibette et al, US 6,627,603, and WO 97/38787, which is a family member of Bibette et al, US 5,938,581 (all of record). Rejections based on the newly cited reference(s) follow.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein

Art Unit: 1712

were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

5. Claims 18-20, 23, and 26-37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Centre National De La Recherche Scientifique, WO 99/07463 (hereafter WO 99/07463), as evidenced by family member of Bibette et al, US 6,627,603, in view of Bibette et al, US 5,938,581 (all of record).

Bibette et al, US 6,627,603, is employed as an English language translation of the WO 97/38787 reference. The disclosures are deemed to be the same or substantially the same as based on the PCT application.

Bibette et al, US 5,938,581, is employed as an English language translation of the WO 97/38787 reference. The disclosures are deemed to be the same or substantially the same as based on the PCT application. The US patents are referred to for citations hereafter.

WO 99/07463 and Bibette et al '603 (abstract; column 4, lines 52 et seq and 67 et seq; column 5, lines 8-9, 20, and 31-35; and claims) disclose releasing an active principle from multiple emulsions. WO 99/07463 and Bibette et al '603 (column 4, lines 67 et seq; particularly column 5, lines 8-9, 20, and 31-35; and claims) disclose the use of alkylene oxide copolymers as water-soluble hydrophilic agents among other surfactants, polyglycerol polyricinoleate as a fat-soluble surfactant and disclose

Art Unit: 1712

hydrophilic active agents from the same fields of endeavor as applicants instantly claimed hydrophilic active agents.

The claim 23 alkylene oxide copolymers are known water soluble hydrophilic alkylene oxide copolymers (Sold under the trademark Pluronic®).

The monodispersed emulsions disclosed and exemplified read on applicants polydispersity of 30% or less, which applicants identify as monodispersed. An ideal monodispersed system would have a polydispersity approaching zero.

WO 99/07463 and Bibette et al '603 (Example 2) discloses the formation of monodispersed double emulsions in a two stage process, wherein a polydispersed W/O emulsion is converted to a monodispersed emulsion under controlled gentle shearing followed by incorporation into an outer aqueous phase. The polydispersed double emulsion would have existed prior to the microfluidizer treatment (column 7, line 31 et seq).

WO 99/07463 and Bibette et al '603 (column 4, lines 52-63) disclose the release of the active principle from the internal phase (A2) may be induced by a compound already in the external environment. WO 99/07463 and Bibette et al '603 further (column 4, lines 59-62) state: "this agent can in particular be . . . or alternatively a hydrocolloid, such as xanthan gum, guar, or carrageenan, and their derivatives." Said hydrocolloids are polysaccharides.

Since the WO 99/07463 and Bibette et al '603 references disclosure of "This agent" appears to be referring to the "alternatively a compound" set forth in the preceding paragraph, the xanthan gum, guar, or carrageenan, and their derivative

Art Unit: 1712

would have been present in "the external environment" that includes the outer phase A2. The reference does not distinguish between the "the external environment" and the A2 phase.

To the extent the WO 99/07463 and Bibette et al '603 references differ from the claims in the concentrations of the hydrocolloids, said concentrations would have been obvious in view of the hydrocolloids are known thickening agents and emulsions having sufficiently high concentrations would become solids and/or gels. Concentrations higher than 10 % by weight would not have been expected already in the external environment based on their thickening properties.

Bibette et al '581 discloses making emulsions from polydispersed emulsions to form a monodispersed emulsion employing controlled shearing. Bibette et al '581 (column 4, lines 17 et seq) disclose the formation of viscoelastic compositions by the further addition of a thickener, such as dextran, where the surfactant does not provide the appropriate viscoelastic effect.

These references are combinable because they teach monodispersed emulsions and methods of making. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicants' invention to employ the methods of Bibette et al '581 in making the emulsions of WO 99/07463 and Bibette et al '603 to form the monodispersed emulsions taught therein as an obvious conventional shearing method of converting a polydispersed system to a monodispersed system.

Art Unit: 1712

Allowable Subject Matter

6. Claims 21-22 and 24-25 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Response to Arguments


7. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 18-37 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Daniel S. Metzmaier whose telephone number is (571) 272-1089. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:00 AM to 5:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Randy P. Gulakowski can be reached on (571) 272-1302. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).


Daniel S. Metzmaier
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1712

DSM